



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,781	05/09/2006	Hiroshi Hanagata	288727US0PCT	3789
22850	7590	11/10/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER MARX, IRENE	
			ART UNIT 1651	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/578,781	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HANAGATA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Irene Marx	<b>Art Unit</b> 1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/19/07, 7/20/06, 5/9/06</u> .                                | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 1651

### DETAILED ACTION

The application should be reviewed for errors.

To facilitate processing of papers at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, it is recommended that the Application Serial Number be inserted on every page of claims and/or of amendments filed.

In keeping with scientific custom, the names of genera and species of microorganisms should be underlined or italicized throughout the specification and claims.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-4 is acknowledged.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Office has not considered as whole the contribution that the claimed products make over the prior art. To begin with, it should be noted that applicant is not claiming a particular strain, but rather members of a species, and in functional terms. Applicant argues that the strain in Modest *et al.* produces spores under certain growth conditions. The invention as claimed does not preclude the production of spores under some circumstances. Only the bacteria of claim 3 require a particular gene, which is "sporulation-associated" to be inactivated at least some of the time. Regarding the classification of the strain of Modest *et al.*, it is noted that the confusion in taxonomy demonstrates that the strain of the reference and the claimed species are at least very closely related if they are not, in fact, the same. Moreover, taxonomy is not an exact science and the name "*Brevibacillus choshinensis*" does not encompass a precise group of strains, in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

The invention as claimed is drawn to several inventions which are not linked by a special technical feature to form a single general inventive concept as is required for unity of invention.

For the reasons outlined and because of the different functional properties required by the strains in the various groups as claimed, the arguments are not persuasive of error in the lack of unity requirement made.

For these reasons, the restriction requirement is deemed proper and is adhered to. The restriction requirement is hereby made FINAL.

Claims 1-4 are being considered on the merits. Claims 5-20 are withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 1651

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because this claim reads on the organism per se which is found in nature and thus, is unpatentable to applicant. Consequently, the claim does not embody patentable subject matter as defined in 35 USC 101. See, e.g., *American Wood v. Fiber Disintegrating Co.*, 90 U.S. 566 (1974); *American Fruit Growers v. Brogdex Co.*, 283 U.S. 1 (1931); *Funk Brothers Seed. Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.*, 33 U.S. 127 (1948); *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 206 U.S.P.Q. 193 (1980).

It is suggested that applicant use the language "a biologically pure culture" in connection with the strain to identify a product that is not found in nature and to indicate the hand of man.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 is confusing in that the term "mycological" is generally used for fungi and not for bacteria.

Claims 3 and 4 use improper nomenclature for the designation of a gene. It is noted that the term "*hos*" should be italicized to denote a gene.

Claim 4 is vague and indefinite in the recitation "sporulation associated gene *hos* has "a" base sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1". It is apparent that a specific sequence is disclosed. This is not claimed with sufficient particularity.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or

Art Unit: 1651

with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The invention appears to employ a specific strain of *B. choshinensis* HPD31-SP3.

It is not clear if the written description is sufficiently repeatable to avoid the need for a deposit. Further it is unclear if the starting materials were readily available to the public at the time of invention.

It appears that a deposit was made in this application as filed as noted on page 33 of the specification. However, it is not clear if the deposit meets all of the criteria set forth in 37 CFR 1.801-1.809. Applicant or applicant's representative may provide assurance of compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, in the following manner.

#### SUGGESTION FOR DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL

A declaration by applicant, assignee, or applicant's agent identifying a deposit of biological material and averring the following may be sufficient to overcome an objection and rejection based on a lack of availability of biological material.

1. Identifies declarant.
2. States that a deposit of the material has been made in a depository affording permanence of the deposit and ready accessibility thereto by the public if a patent is granted. The depository is to be identified by name and address.
3. States that the deposited material has been accorded a specific (recited) accession number.
4. States that all restriction on the availability to the public of the material so deposited will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent.
5. States that the material has been deposited under conditions that access to the material will be available during the pendency of the patent application to one determined by the Commissioner to be entitled thereto under 37 CFR 1.14 and 35 U.S.C § 122.
6. States that the deposited material will be maintained with all the care necessary to keep it viable and uncontaminated for a period of at least five years after the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited microorganism, and in any case,

Art Unit: 1651

for a period of at least thirty (30) years after the date of deposit for the enforceable life of the patent, whichever period is longer.

7. That he/she declares further that all statements made therein of his/her own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true, and further that these statements were made with knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the instant patent application or any patent issuing thereon.

Alternatively, it may be averred that deposited material has been accepted for deposit under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the purpose of Patent Procedure (e.g. see 961 OG 21, 1977) and that all restrictions on the availability to the public of the material so deposited will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent.

Additionally, the deposit must be referred to in the body of the specification and be identified by deposit (accession) number, date of deposit, name and address of the depository and the complete taxonomic description.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modest *et al.* taken with Frascotti *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,284,490.) and Matsuzaki *et al.*, (J. of Bacteriology, June 1985, Vol. 162, pages 1336-1338).

Modest *et al.* disclose a strain of *B. brevis* which appears to be at least closely related to the claimed strain, such that it belongs of a species that has been renamed "*Brevibacillus choshinensis*". The invention as claimed does not preclude the production of spores under some circumstances. Only the bacteria of claim 3 require a particular gene, which is "sporulation-

Art Unit: 1651

associated" to be inactivated at least some of the time. Regarding the classification of the strain of Modest *et al.*, it is noted that the confusion in taxonomy demonstrates that the strain of the reference and the claimed species are at least very closely related if they are not, in fact, the same. Moreover, taxonomy is not an exact science and the name "*Brevibacillus choshinensis*" does not encompass a precise group of strains, in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Whether or not the strain of Modest *et al.* produces spores under certain growth conditions does not pertain to the invention as claimed in claim 1, for example, since the invention as claimed does not preclude the production of spores under some circumstances. Applicant is not claiming a particular strain having particular properties.

The reference differs from the claimed invention in the disclosure of inactivated *hos* gene. However, Frascotti *et al.* demonstrate that asporogenous strains of related bacteria, such as *B. subtilis* are known (See, e.g., Example 1) and Matsuzaki *et al.* disclose that the *hos* gene has at least some role in sporulation, i.e., it is "sporulation-associated". See, e.g., page 1337, col. 2..

Inasmuch as a *hos* gene of *Brevibacillus choshinensis* claim is inactivated, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized at the time the claimed invention was made that the strain as claimed and the strain of Modest *et al.* and the claimed strain are at least very closely related, if not the same, since the respective gene is known in the art to be "sporulation-associated" in at least some strains of *Bacillus*.

Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Marx whose telephone number is (571) 272-0919. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 .

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Irene Marx/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1651